

Categorical Exclusion Not Established by Statute

Grazing Preference Transfer for the Lost Gulch Allotment (name change only)

DOI-BLM-AZ-P020-2011-003-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: ***Lower Sonoran Field Office (LSFO)***

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: N/A

Proposed Action Title/Type: Grazing Preference Transfer for the Lost Gulch Allotment (#06014)

Location of Proposed Action: **Globe, AZ**

Description of Proposed Action: Phelps Dodge Miami Inc changed its name to Freeport-McMoRan Miami, Inc. All business entities associated with this business, including livestock operation, fall under this change. No other actions required.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: *Phoenix Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP, 1988 and Amendment to the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan and Decision Record (2005)*

Date Approved/Amended: **1988, 2005**

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Allotment permit and preference transfers are necessary administrative actions when ownership or name changes occur in relation to the preference, base property or base water.

C: Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 2, Appendix 1, or 516 DM 11.5: *BLM NEPA Handbook, H-1710-1, Appendix 4.D.1.*

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 or 516 DM 11.5 apply.

I considered this action as an administrative action that has no or negligible effect any aspect of the human environment.

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: _____ / S / _____ Date: _____05/06/11_____

Emily Garber
Lower Sonoran Field Office Manager

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:

Andrea Felton, Rangeland Management Specialist, LSFO, 623-580-5524

Note: A separate decision document must be prepared for the action covered by the CX. See Attachment 2.

BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances¹

Attachment 1

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215) apply. The project would: | | |
| 1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>This is an administrative action involving name change documentation. No other actions were necessary. Also, this allotment had an allotment evaluation conducted in 2001, in which the affected environment was assessed. No known changes have occur that might impact this allotment transfer.</i> |
| 2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>See #1</i> |
| 3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>See #1</i> |
| 4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>N/A. See #1</i> |
| 5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>This is a common administrative action defined by the BLM NEPA handbook as Categorical Excludable action</i> |
| 6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>N/A See #1</i> |

¹ If an action has any of these impacts, you must conduct NEPA analysis.

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or office? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>N/A See #1</i> |
| 8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>N/A. See #1.</i> |
| 9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>N/A</i> |
| 10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>N/A</i> |
| 11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>N/A</i> |
| 12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>see #1</i> |

Approval and Decision

Attachment 2

Compliance and assignment of responsibility: Andrea Felton, RMS, LSFO

Monitoring and assignment of responsibility: Andrea Felton, RMS, LSFO

Review: *We have determined that the proposal is in accordance with the categorical exclusion criteria and that it would not involve any significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review.*

Prepared by: _____/S/_____ **Date:** 2 / 1 8 / 1 1

Andrea Felton

Project Lead

Reviewed by: _____/S/_____ **Date:** 2 / 2 4 / 1 1

Leah Baker

Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by: _____/S/_____ **Date:** 5 / 6 / 1 1

Emily Garber

Manager

Project Description:

Grazing Preference Transfer for the Lost Gulch Allotment, #06014.

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

Approved By: _____/S/_____ **Date:** ____5/6/11_____